

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY PROFESSOR
REUBEN E. WOOD, CHAIRMAN OF THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY OF
THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Mr. Chairman:

Before presenting the Committee's interim report, I should like to make some very brief explanatory comments. First, the facts and judgments to be presented in our short interim report came from many hours of hearings and many pages of stenographic record. Our understanding with those who furnished us with our information was that statements which they made in our hearings would not be attributed to them without specific permission, and we have not thought it desirable to seek such permission.

Second, the interim report which I shall read shortly has not been seen in its final form by Professor Kraus. However, except for very minor modifications and rearrangement of sentences and paragraphs, it is the interim report the three of us agreed to present before he left for Europe early in September. None of us would have written quite this report had he had the full responsibility. Its form and substance represent a considerable amount of give and take, but we all agree to it.

Finally, it is an interim report in that it presents a summary of our findings on the matter of the selection of our new president but does not, with one exception, present recommendations. One of the reasons that these recommendations are not included is simply that we have not yet had time to consider carefully what they should be. But in my judgment, there is an additional good reason.

Almost always there are many proposals that might be made for achieving an agreed-upon end. The best proposals will fit the circumstances in which they are made. The University has a new President-elect and the Board of Trustees has a new Chairman. We shall know better how to pursue our purposes when we have become a little acquainted with these new administrations. I would not propose any lengthy delay in formulating recommendations. But I would hope, and we shall all hope and watch, during whatever delay there may be, for actions taken by the Board and by the new University administration which will themselves improve Faculty-Trustee relationships and perhaps, in so doing, will ease the task of this committee in formulating its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I now proceed to read the Committee's Interim Report.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY
OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Interim Report on the Matter of the
Selection of the New President of the
University

At its special meeting on June 7, 1965, the Faculty Assembly passed this resolution:

"That the Faculty Assembly appoint a committee consisting of Professor Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, and Professor Wolfgang H. Kraus and Roderic H. Davison, former chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate, to ascertain the facts in all cases in which the Board of Trustees have not seen fit or do not see fit to follow the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly or the University Senate and, with all reasonable speed to report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly."

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Colclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison as pro tempore member of the Committee to serve in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country. The present interim report is the first report of this standing committee.

The commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed. Specifically, these issues are: 1) The matter of the Senate resolution on faculty salaries, 2) the matter of the Senate-adopted report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics, and 3) the matter of the selection of the new president of the University.

Some facts have been collected concerning the first two items, but the Committee felt that its most urgent assignment was the investigation of the presidential selection process, and it concentrated its efforts on this investigation. The other two items will be the subject of future study and reports. The remainder of this report concerns the selection of the new president. Here we shall present findings of fact and shall, with one exception, defer our recommendations to a subsequent report.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the

Chairman wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice-Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Dean of Faculties John A. Brown, Deans Linton and Burns, and the President-designate, Lloyd H. Elliott. There were interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. We were received with a great showing of cooperation. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions.

The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

Individual members of the Committee also checked certain details of time and dates and texts of relevant written material with other persons who had detailed information on these matters. This checking was done to amplify and verify information received in our formal interviews.

This Committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not provide an adequate opportunity for exploring issues with the Board, for supporting the Faculty position, and for achieving a meeting of minds.

The following paragraphs state in summary form the basis for this conclusion:

- 1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. This

communication, we feel, was inadequate.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless should have had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the full legal authority of the Board in this matter, it assumed that any reasoned disapproval on its part would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board, at least until that obstacle had been cleared. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by the Faculty Committee or the Faculty which had established it. The last President of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another Faculty Committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. This fact could be considered a significant precedent. Moreover, one candidate in the present search who had been regarded as most acceptable by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth to the Chairman its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it clear that during the May/June period, the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were lacking in candor. In view of the

fundamental requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this lack introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process. We have also learned that Dr. Elliott was offered and accepted the presidency of The George Washington University without disclosure of the adverse recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee. We believe that his acceptance of this position under such circumstances put him in a very embarrassing position both in Maine and in Washington, D. C. for which he was not primarily responsible. We recommend that the Faculty welcome Dr. Lloyd Elliott as the new President of The George Washington University.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee or its Chairman for the first four months meaningful information as to the candidates under active consideration, was the result of inaction by the Board Committee. It also affected adversely the Faculty Committee's role and made it appear to be somewhat of an outsider in the selection process. While the information on a number of names was available in the winter for several months, progress in the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) The lack of indications to the Faculty from its Committee, to show continuing positive action in the process of selection, stimulated individual communications to the Board of Trustees, out of channels, by Faculty members. It would appear that the first memorandum from the Deans and Chairmen to the Board of Trustees dated May 8, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee for much the same reasons. While these actions were undertaken by members of the University moved by a deep concern for the welfare of the University, they had some unintended side effects; a) from the point of view of some of those persons primarily concerned in the selection process, they appeared to diminish the authority

of the Faculty Committee, and b) in the eyes of some members of the Board of Trustees, they appeared to be manifestations of improper group pressures from the Faculty.

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington press in this process. At critical stages both before the Board of Trustees made its choice, and on several occasions afterward, the local newspapers displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility which was shown in possibly unavoidable inadequacy in factual reporting and in distorted editorial comment. The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University's situation.

Inasmuch as the connection between key members of the University Board of Trustees and the two leading Washington newspapers is widely known, this relationship has unfortunately lent in the eyes of some persons a certain plausibility to the view that these papers allowed themselves to be used as an instrument in the relations between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University. We deplore this view as over-simplified, but we also deplore the press activities which made possible these allegations.

* * * * *

Your Committee will continue its investigations of the matters within our commission on Faculty/Trustee relations, and will make reports on these issues, together with its recommendations, at subsequent meetings of the Faculty Assembly.

Sgd: Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

Wolfgang H. Kraus

James Forrester Davison

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The election of the Trustees Committee for the selection of a new President of the George Washington University, consisting of 13 members, and ^{of} a Faculty Committee of 10 members was completed during September 1964. Faculty members expressed concern that the size of the two Committees would make ~~for~~ real cooperation between them rather difficult. This conclusion was more than justified in the following months. The Chairman of the Board of Trustees was also the Chairman of their Committee and in that capacity played a dominant role both in the Trustees Committee, and in acting as the primary, and for many months, the only point of contact between the two Committees. Procedures were established for the exchange of names of possible candidates between the two groups during October. A set of Faculty criteria was formulated and given to the Trustees ~~Chairman~~ and later submitted to the Faculty Assembly and approved. No formal action was taken on these criteria by the Trustees' Committee and no written approval was given by or requested from the Board Chairman concerning these criteria formulated by the Faculty. He only accepted them informally in a conversation with the Faculty members.

One formal meeting of the two Committees was held in the month of October. They did not meet again until April 1965. In the meantime, by correspondence with the Trustees Chairman and by oral contacts between him and Faculty ^{Committee} members certain policies were given a de facto status. It had been intimated at the October joint meeting that pending the National Elections no active proposals would be made or considered. The idea was expressed by some Trustees that the President's re-election would not occur, and this event or some other would make available for our Presidency high-ranking Executives with a truly international reputation, whose arrival would quickly put the University in a top rank. Political dislike for the President did not apparently preclude taking on

one of his chief advisers rejected by the voters.

During the first 10 days of December 1964, it had become apparent that in addition to his election successes, the President was retaining the principal members of the Cabinet, whose names had been considered by The George Washington University Trustees. At this point the search for a professional educator began in earnest, with the selection by the Chairman of the Trustees of about ten names for the Faculty Committee to consider. For various reasons, only three of these outside persons became actively under consideration. One name of a man who had been rejected in the earlier search, which ended on the selection of Dr. Carroll, was again very summarily rejected by members of the Faculty Committee. While the Trustees Chairman said he disagreed strongly with the Faculty estimate, he did not again press for consideration of this man. This incident together with his apparent acceptance of the Faculty criteria in October, led members of the Faculty to believe that a policy of approval of a candidate by Faculty and Trustees would be considered requisite for the selection of any candidate. The two groups next did agree, happily, on such a candidate. The Faculty then requested and obtained approval for a field trip to the University of the candidate to make on the spot investigations, other than personal interviews with him. The two Faculty members came back and reported very favorably on this man. Unhappily, despite a period of extensive investigation by him of the University, he ultimately refused the informal offers despite a proffered renewal in pressing terms.

At this point, another distinguished educator who was under consideration had received locally unfavorable publicity of his consideration of our offer as a result of a local leak on his own Faculty. While he came for a visit and formal interviews, he did not meet the Faculty Committee. He did meet the administrative officers and a member of one of the professional faculties through a private contact. He also had a long conversation by telephone with a private individual with University contacts. He later found his own local situation prevented his acceptance here.

It was in this period of the search that the second full meeting of the two Committees had occurred and some recrimination from the Board Committee concerning alleged Faculty participation in the leak to the last candidate's institution led to a realization of a mounting tension between the two groups. Until the final weeks in late May and early June no other joint meetings between the two full committees were held. The Faculty Committee did meet with a group of the Board of Trustees Committee once, in this in-between-meetings period.

In this period with the rapid elimination of desirable outside candidates and the decline in administrative activity in the University, a strong group among the Deans and Chairmen of University Departments held a meeting and signed a petition to be sent directly to the Board of Trustees urging the early consideration and appointment of the present Dean of Faculties as President. This document was not signed by all of the University Deans or all the administrative officials in educational posts. It was transmitted at personal interviews to the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary of the full Board of Trustees who indicated in each instance a willingness to consider this proposal. In one instance at least the Chairman had earlier rejected this man's candidacy in very strong terms, but he now appeared to believe that the spontaneity and wide espousal of the name indicated a matter of such importance that the Board would consider him.

During the week-end that this document was produced and signed, the Trustees' Chairman authorized investigations concerning at least two other persons for the first time as really serious candidates, i. e. the period from May 7 to May 11. One of these men was Dr. Elliott who was interviewed by a Trustee in New York City about May 11 and received such a very favorable report that in a letter of May 11 the Trustees Chairman indicated to the Faculty Chairman that now three candidates were actively under consideration, Brown, Elliott and a third man who was later eliminated.

The Faculty Committee had an internal dispute which apparently led to a serious decline in its effectiveness in the last few months of the search for a new President. As the list of available candidates was exhausted by the end of

April and early in May no new list appeared likely, the name of John Anthony Brown which had been in the forefront within the University again became a matter of grave concern. Faculty sentiment, especially as indicated by the letter of May 8th signed by a number of Deans and Chairmen of University Departments, indicated a very strong support for his candidacy. This matter led a group on the Faculty Committee to conclude that since the Committee was not equally strongly for Dr. Brown, they were no longer a properly representative group of the Faculty as a whole. An attempt by three members to resign was temporarily resisted within the Committee. This resignation was prompted by the feeling that with no new candidates being presented by either the Faculty or the Trustees Committees, the Committee either should insist on Dr. Brown or go back to the Faculty and report the stalemate. At this point the new candidacies of Presidents Coes of Bowdoin and Elliott of Maine were developed and the resignations were withdrawn. But the basic issue was never settled as to whether the Faculty Committee members were delegates free to use their own best judgment, or Faculty representatives to reflect current faculty opinion, and if desirable, check back periodically with the Faculty to get the most recent opinion. The better attitude in the judgment of this Committee was that they were independent delegates expected to use their own best judgment.

The Faculty Committee then made inquiries concerning Dr. Elliott and came up with favorable reports which appear in a memorandum from the Faculty members. Dr. Elliott accordingly was invited to come for interviews and did have such interviews on May 28. Before his arrival, however, yielding to strong representations in behalf of persons in the University, a Trustees Committee group interviewed four senior administrators for consideration for appointment as Vice President or President of the University. None of those interviewed appears to have felt that this interview involved any firm or even serious proposals, but was rather a pro forma gesture to internal pride of personnel.

Dr. Elliott came on May 28 and was interviewed by the University Deans, had lunch with the Faculty Committee and met privately some Trustees who had not met him with their Committee group. The Faculty group appeared to have been puzzled by ex tempore remarks made by Dr. Elliott at the luncheon, one being that "The Trustees are the boss. The President and the Faculty are only hired hands." The other remark was that he "intended to make the Board of Trustees work for the full advancement of the University wherever he went." A certain conflict in these attitudes was not explained nor apparently even commented upon to him. Nevertheless, the Faculty Committee must have been sufficiently well impressed by the candidate for they wished to send two members to the University of Maine to make on-the-spot investigations. The Board Committee agreed to this request, and since Memorial Day week-end intervened, it was agreed that they would not be in Maine until June 1 and 2.

The Deans who interviewed Dr. Elliott were asked to submit in writing that day their estimate of him as a candidate, which letter was to be addressed to the Acting President. Their reactions appear to have ranged from tepid approvals in cautious terms (when compared with the two other candidates, i. e. Dr. Brown and a third person) to outright disapproval. As a group, they also were moved to write another general letter, this time to the Faculty Committee, expressing their belief that Dr. Elliott was third in their choice of the three candidates and ranked lowest in academic qualifications.

While the Faculty Committee members were in Maine, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees sent a special delivery letter dated June 1 to an uncertain number of the Board of Trustees. This letter which was postmarked June 2 enclosed a curriculum vitae on Dr. Elliott and expressed the belief that he was sure to be the Board Committee's recommendation to the full Board at the June 5 meeting.

The Faculty members returned June 2, reported to their Committee on June 3 their adverse conclusions on Dr. Elliott, and again reported to the Board Committee on June 4. The Board Committee said they would like to consider this report overnight

and would have a joint meeting about 10:45 a.m. June 5 before the full Board meeting at noon. They would give their decision to the Faculty Committee at that meeting as to their recommendation to the full Board. At this point, the Chairman of the Trustees Committee called Dr. Elliott in Maine and reported a verification of his earlier report to Dr. Elliott that the Faculty Committee "had given him a clean bill of health," but had one difficulty with Dr. Elliott's appointment of a Graduate Dean in Maine. This appointment was explained by Dr. Elliott to the Chairman who appeared to be satisfied. It is to be noted ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ that the two petitions in favor of John Anthony Brown were not disclosed ^{was} to Dr. Elliott, nor the fact that the Faculty Committee had made a generally adverse report.

Dr. Elliott was not further contacted in Maine until the conclusion of the Trustee's full Board meeting about 5 p.m., June 5. At the early meeting with the Faculty Committee on June 5, the chairman explained he had called Dr. Elliott about the controversial appointment in Maine, and was satisfied with his reply and his expressed desire to avoid such mistakes in the future. They then said they would recommend Dr. Elliott to the full Board Meeting. The Faculty Chairman requested an opportunity to appear at the Board Meeting and restate the Faculty position. He was told "No outsiders are admitted to the Board Meeting." Until then, he did not know that he was an outsider. Later the Board Committee changed its position and invited the entire Faculty Committee or any of its designated members to appear at the full Board Meeting. It was decided that the Faculty Chairman and the other member who had been in Maine would attend the Trustees' meeting.

After several postponements of their appearance, they were invited about 2:45 p.m. to join the Trustees' meeting. The Faculty Chairman spoke for 10-15 minutes, expressed his gratification at receiving the invitation to speak, and made polite remarks about the ability of the Board to make a correct decision which he felt the Faculty could support. The Chairman of the Trustees echoed these sentiments to the applause of those present. The Trustees' Chairman then invited the

other Faculty member to add any remarks he might care to make. The Trustees' Chairman had heard this member speak at the joint meeting the day before. The Faculty members withdrew, and the then Trustees' Vice Chairman read all the Dean's confidential letters on Dr. Elliott discussing his ranking with the other two candidates. The Board voted unanimously to appoint Dr. Elliott. The Board Chairman called Dr. Elliott long distance and reported the offer and waited until he had Dr. Elliott's oral acceptance, which he reported to the Board. News of the appointment was then released to the Faculty and press.

Dr. Elliott was in a very delicate position after he had talked with Chairman Ellison on Saturday afternoon, June 5, and had accepted the presidency of The George Washington University. He had the final event of Commencement Week that evening a dinner and Alumni Meeting at which he was the principal speaker. The 6 o'clock radio news in Maine carried the announcement of his appointment in Washington, D. C. as the President of The George Washington University which his Public Relations Office had heard. He and his Public Relations man then agreed it was up to him to announce it that night in Maine to his Alumni group meeting. He did so and indicated thereby his resignation as President of the University of Maine. When, therefore, he later learned of the opposition to his appointment at The George Washington University, he was in a very unfavorable position at both institutions.

Through failure of transmission, the Faculty learned of the appointment first from radio, T.V., and the Press early that evening. Dr. Elliott learned of the Faculty's adverse reactions, before and after the appointment, from reporters for the first time Monday afternoon. He also learned for the first time that new officers of the Board of Trustees had now taken over. It is not surprising that he was gravely distressed and hurt by this means of communicating this relevant adverse information.

The Trustees' Committee and members have indicated that there was additional favorable information on Dr. Elliott, which the Faculty Committee did not have. We have not been able to learn the nature or content of this information. We have not been able to understand why the appointment was announced so rapidly without giving to the Faculty Committee the nature of this favorable new information and let^{ting} it consider the matter. Some fear has been expressed that the appointment could not have been approved until the next Board of Trustees meeting to be held in October. No reason was given why a special meeting could not have been held, nor why the announcement could not have been delayed until a suitable time for the Faculty and its Committee to consider and evaluate the more favorable information on which the Trustees' decision was based. Indeed a policy of making everything the Faculty said and did immediately available to the Board and to the Press was clearly followed. But the Trustees Committee did not suggest that the Board's remarks and actions should likewise be made fully available to the Faculty, under the provision in the Faculty Code to "advise and consult" in the selection and appointment of a new University President.

2nd

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Concerning the Causes of the Differences of Opinion
Between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees in a
Number of Matters including the Selection of a New
President for the University

I

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Colclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison, in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country, to complete the group of three members of this special committee. The Committee got under way at once and decided to interview as many people as possible who had been connected with the selection of a new president first.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two former alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Deans Linton, Burns, and John A. Brown and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott. This involved interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions. The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

While the commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed, because of its importance, the Committee concentrated on the work of the Faculty Committee and the Board of Trustees Committee for the selection of a new president for the University. In three instances, the Committee did discuss briefly with persons being interviewed the question of the AAUP minimum salary scale and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics of the Senate. Both of these Faculty recommendations were rejected by the Board of Trustees. If there is time, it is hoped that more information on these subjects may be obtained from persons connected with the Trustees' decisions. Individual members of the Committee also checked personally certain details of time, dates and texts of relative ^{evant} written material with other persons who had personal information in detail on these matters. This checking was done to verify information received in our former interviews.

Our special committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not prove adequate to achieve the purposes which the Faculty had in mind in these cases. The following state in summary form the basis for these conclusions:

- 1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. As stated below, this communication was not always adequate for the purposes.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. While the Faculty Committee agreed to its general principles, it never received, nor requested from the Chairman or from the Trustees Committee approval of or agreement to these principles.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement between the two Committees as to whether or not the selection of the new president should be based upon approval of each committee or whether the Board should ~~not~~ seek approval from the Faculty Committee. It was clear at all times, however, that the Board retained and reserved the formal legal authority to make the appointment.

4) In the May/June period, there appeared to be a distinct lack of candor in the communications from the Chairman of the Board Committee with the Faculty Committee.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee, or its Chairman, meaningful information as to the process of selection, for at least six months, adversely affected the Faculty Committee's relations with the Faculty as a whole and ~~many~~ ^{with} University administrators. While ~~the~~ information was available for several months, the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) As a result of the lack of any reports from the Faculty Committee indicating continuing positive action in the process of selection, a number of individual communications out of channels were made by faculty members to the Board of Trustees. It would appear that for the same reason, the first Deans and Chairmen's memorandum to the Board of Trustees, dated May 8th, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee.

II

Your Committee is continuing its investigation of a number of matters which appear to be of general concern in faculty-trustee relationships. These may be stated in summary form as follows:

1) There appeared to be in the Faculty Committee on the Selection of a President a lack of understanding or of agreement as to the Committee's role in the selection process. In advising and consulting with the Board of Trustees Committee, the Faculty Committee was unable to agree as to whether this role was, a) that of a group of delegates empowered to use their own best judgment without referring back to the Faculty, or b) that of elected representatives to reflect the Faculty's position as it changed from time to time and therefore, requiring some referral back to the Faculty for instruction.

2) In this Committee's discussion with some of the Board of Trustees and Administrative personnel, it appeared that the language and basis for value judgments in these matters are not commonly understood by the Board and the Faculty representatives. Since the selection of a president is an unusual and to-be-hoped rare operation for the University, it has the nature of a fire brigade emergency operation. To obtain an understanding of the common language and basis for value judgments, it would require more continuing and diverse contacts between the two groups. It would appear that some recommendations should be worked out to enter into a continuing and meaningful dialogue between representatives of the Faculty and the Board of Trustees on the evaluation of matters which are of common concern and interest to both groups.

3) Your committee is studying the question of whether there is a need for further textual revisions of the Faculty Code concerning the selection procedures for a President and a Dean of Faculties. It is hoping to make a fuller report on this matter at a later time.

4) As indicated above, the principal issue discussed by this Committee with the persons interviewed had to do with the procedures for the selection of a new President. Two other disagreements occurred during the same period between the Senate Committees and the Board of Trustees. These had to do with a) a recommendation that the Board adopt the principle of an early improvement in Faculty salaries to bring the University scale within the range of the second category of the AAUP minimum standards, and b) the Special Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics of the University Senate's recommendation to curtail the heavy expense of intercollegiate football in order to conserve the University's financial resources for other recreational purposes. The Board Committee recommended the extension of the University's football activities and at the same time extension of other recreational and athletic facilities and events. In our discussion of these two items with Trustees, it appeared that there are economic questions and educational policy questions which require a further study and particularly an application of some better basis for understanding as indicated in Paragraph 2) immediately above. The time necessary for this operation may indeed be too great for the Faculty Committees to work out a common understanding or agreement with the Trustees in view of the University's needs and the Middle States Accreditation Report. Your committee believes that the intangible and economic matters involved should have an immediate referral to some experienced educational consultants of these two matters as a more productive and prompt method of solving these very difficult questions. It is hoped that recommendations in detail on these points can be made in a later report.

1st

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY
ASSEMBLY CONCERNING THE CAUSES OF THE DIFFERENCES
OF OPINION BETWEEN THE FACULTY AND THE BOARD OF
TRUSTEES IN A NUMBER OF MATTERS INCLUDING THE
SELECTION OF A NEW PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

I

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Colclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison, in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country, to complete the group of three members of this special committee. The Committee got under way at once and decided to interview as many people as possible who had been connected with the selection of a new president first.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to ^{us} ~~it~~. In several instances it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to ~~make~~ communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two former alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Deans Linton, Burns, and John A. Brown and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott. This involved interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions. The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

While the commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed, because of its importance, the Committee concentrated on the work of the

Faculty Committee and the Board of Trustees Committee for the selection of a new president for the University. In three instances, the Committee did discuss briefly with persons being interviewed the question of the AAUP minimum salary scale and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics ~~Committee~~ of the Senate. Both of these Faculty recommendations were rejected by the Board of Trustees. If there is time, it is hoped that more information on these subjects may be obtained from persons connected with the Trustees' decisions. Individual members of the Committee also checked personally certain details of time, dates and texts of relative written material with other persons who had personal information in detail on these matters. This checking was done to verify information received in our former interviews.

Our special committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not prove adequate to achieve the purposes which the Faculty had in mind in these cases. The following state in summary form the basis for these conclusions:

1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two ~~committees~~ ^{who} through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees ~~and~~ was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. As stated below, this communication was not always adequate for the purposes.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. While the Faculty Committee agreed to its general principles, it never received, nor requested from the Chairman or from the Trustees Committee,

approval of or agreement to these principles.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement between the two Committees as to whether or not the selection of the new president should be based upon approval of each committee or whether the Board ~~did~~ should not seek approval from the Faculty Committee. It was clear at all times, however, that the Board retained and reserved the formal legal authority to make the appointment.

4) In the May/June period, there appeared to be a distinct lack of candor in the communications from the Chairman of the Board Committee with the Faculty Committee.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee, or its Chairman, meaningful information as to the process of selection for at least six months adversely affected the Faculty Committees relations with the Faculty as a whole and many University administrators. While the information was available for several months, the process of selection appeared to have come to ~~an~~ a dead end early in the month of May.

6) As a result of the lack of any reports from the Faculty Committee indicating continuing positive action in the process of selection, a number of individual communications out of channels were made by faculty members to the Board of Trustees. It would appear that for the same reason, the first Deans and Chairmen's memorandum to the Board of Trustees, dated May 8th, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee.

II

Your Committee is continuing its investigation of a number of matters which appear to be of general concern in faculty-trustee relationships. These may be stated in summary form as follows:

1) There appear^{ED} to be in the Faculty Committee on the Selection of a

President a lack of understanding or of agreement as to the Committee's role ~~as~~ in the selection process. In advising and consulting with the Board of Trustees Committee, the Faculty Committee was unable to agree as to whether this role was, a) that of a group of delegates empowered to use their own best judgment without referring back to the Faculty, or b) ^{that of} elected representatives to reflect the Faculty's position as it changed from time to time and therefore, requiring some referral back to the faculty for instruction.

2) In this Committee's discussion with some of the Board of Trustees and administrative personnel, it appeared that the language and basis for value judgments in these matters are not commonly understood by the Board and the Faculty representatives. Since the selection of a president is an unusual and to-be-hoped rare operation for the University, it has the nature of a fire brigade emergency operation. To obtain an understanding of the common language and basis for value judgments, it would require more continuing and diverse contacts between the two groups. It would appear that some recommendations should be worked out to enter into a continuing and meaningful dialogue between representatives of the Faculty and the Board of Trustees on the evaluation of matters which are of common concern and interest to both groups.

3) Your committee is studying the question as to whether there is a need for further textual revisions of the Faculty Code concerning the selection procedures for a President and a Dean of Faculties. It is hoping ^{fuller} to make a ~~formal~~ report on this matter at a later time.

4) As indicated above, the principal issue discussed by this Committee with the persons interviewed had to do with the procedures for the selection of a new President. Two other disagreements occurred during the same period between the Senate Committees and the Board of Trustees. These had to do with a) a recommendation that the Board adopt the principle of an early

improvement in Faculty salaries to bring the University scale within the range of the second category of the AAUP minimum standards. The Ad Hoc Special Committee on Athletics of the University Senate recommended the curtailment of the heavy expense of intercollegiate football in order to conserve the University's financial resources for other recreational purposes. The Board Committee recommended the extension of the University's football activities and at the same time extension of other recreational and athletic facilities and events. In our discussions of these two items with Trustees, it appeared that there are economic questions and educational policy questions which require a further study and particularly an application of some better basis for understanding as indicated in Paragraph 2) immediately above. The time necessary for this operation may indeed be too great in view of the University's needs and the Middle States Accreditation Report ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ for the Faculty committees to work out ^a ~~a~~ common understanding or agreement with the Trustees, ⁱ ~~In~~ view of the intangible and economic matters involved. Moreover, your Committee believes that an immediate referral to some experienced educational consultants of these two matters would be a more productive and prompt method of solving these very different questions. It is hoped that recommendations in detail on these points can be made in a later report.

The Committee of Inquiry met with Mr. Van Story, a member of the Board of Trustees, on July 22 for the purpose of receiving his recollections and views on the matters which are of concern to the Committee. Professors Wood, Kraus and Davison were present at the meeting.

Mr. Wood reviewed the purposes of the Committee and Mr. Van Story recounted the following:

Mr. Van Story said that the main thing he was interested in is the relationship between the Board and the combined parts of the University, the Faculty and the Alumni. He has felt for a long time, and has expressed himself on it often, (which has made him somewhat unpopular), the lack of communication among all of them. He feels he is in a rather unique position in that he is a member of the Board of Trustees and has close contacts among the administrative people and the Faculty, and can see the interplay of personalities. He does not believe the Board of Trustees has really understood the role of the Faculty in the University especially as set forth in the Faculty Code. He said there is a segment of the Board (not just at The George Washington University, but all over) that does not understand the role of a Faculty today.

These people think in terms of finance and capital. They see members of the Faculty as they saw them in the 30's and they see no reason to change their thinking. They are primarily interested in the tangible aspects of administration. Mr. Van Story said he was not being supercilious or critical - just stating a fact. The Board is not being aggressive or saying things to be nasty in these situations. They just have not felt there was anything to be concerned about.

(Here there were some remarks about the "Marvin regime.")

Mr. Van Story said Mr. Marvin's view was that he would be happy to have the alumni contribute and go away. This goes back to his experience in Mexico. There was no question but that Marvin ran an autocratic regime and Mr. Van Story thinks, or rather he knows, that the alumni found their relationship with the Trustees less than good. President Colclough too was adamant that there be no relationship except through him. As President of the Alumni Association, Mr. Van Story did not like this. They had many arguments about it.

Mr. Van Story felt that President Carroll did not give the Board of Trustees the kind of briefing they needed on Faculty problems. He said that President Carroll had very strong views on various subjects, and speaking of the Reichard case, for instance, he (Dr. Carroll) thought the Board was "stupid" not to have given Reichard in the first place what he eventually got. The AAUP is a hard subject to deal with at a Board meeting. He said that President Carroll would read off a letter or part of a letter and that was it. It was never presented in such a way that the Board could act upon it. Dr. Marvin did not want the Board to participate and Dr. Carroll felt he should interpose himself between the Board and the rest of the University. He would say that Dr. Carroll actually continued one policy of Dr. Marvin, which was to shield the Trustees from unpleasant knowledge about certain aspects of the University.

(There was a general discussion here about the relative influence of Mr. Herzog upon the Board's decisions, President Colclough's influence upon President Carroll (or lack of it) etc.)

Mr. Van Story said Mr. Herzog has a wonderful reputation with the Board because of his fine work in finance, legal matters, etc. His influence is especially felt by people like the Flemings, McKees and Lawsons(?) who contribute greatly to the University, their views may not be appropriate to the problems we have today.

Mr. Van Story said that until the Faculty, Alumni, Administration and Trustees learn to communicate, none of our problems will be solved. He has the feeling that Dr. Elliott

will do better in this regard and there will be a change. He feels, however, that the problem of communication failure lies with the Administration rather than with the Board of Trustees. The Board was never given any definitive information but were presented with a fait accompli in most cases. It was difficult to question Carroll or Colclough.

Q. The Board is in a position of advising a number of individuals. The Board is composed of people, many of whom have had past academic experience. How do you explain the fact that none of these people "took the bit in their teeth" and concerned themselves directly with one or another of the problems of the University?

A. Mr. Van Story said it was made quite obvious that the Board was to concern itself superficially only. They were to receive conclusions and act upon them. This attitude was conveyed to the Board by the President and the Acting President. Some of the new members of the Board want to become involved now. They will be increasingly involved even if Dr. Elliott does not want them to be. Much has come to the surface in the last few years. The Board is reconstructing itself.

Many of the people are very busy. They sense the problems, but they have had to defer to their elected officials. (There were increasing reservations about Carroll's leadership)

Q. Was there any awareness of a change in the President's personality after the start of his final illness?

A. In large institutions, things move slowly. There was increasing awareness of a critical situation. If he had left, this would not have gone unattended. The Board had become increasingly involved and some of the new Trustees proved very interested in being in the picture.

Q. What is the procedure by which new Board membership is added?

A. President Carroll suggested a number of these new Trustees in order to "nationalize" the Board. It was a contribution which he definitely made. Many come up through Alumni-Trustee ranks, like Ellison, Mitchell, etc.

Q. Why did not Garfinkel leave any money to the University? He was very interested in it in his life time. Why did not Mrs. Carr, who recently died? What is the matter with this University?

A. They have never been asked. The University has been run by one man and it is too big to be run by one man. He has to reach into all parts of the University. As to soliciting funds, nothing aggressive has been done about that for the last four or five years.

Q. What about Dr. Elliott's qualifications. Mr. Morris stated in our interview with him that the Board had made some investigations of its own and had considerable information which was not available to the Faculty. What new information do they have?

A. The only thing I know about him was that I was given some biographical data; I went to the meeting; and I listened to what was said by all parties. That is the extent of my information on Dr. Elliott.

Q. Why did the Board, when it felt impelled to act with such haste, not explain the reasons to the Faculty Committee?

A. I think you are trying to solve an emotional matter by logic. There is a natural inhibition between the Board and the Faculty. Each feels it has its own prerogatives. The Board has a strong feeling that the Faculty was not unbiased - I am referring to Jack Brown.

Mr. Van Story was interested to the extent that a full disclosure be made of the petitions for Brown at the Board meeting. Mr. McKelway did read all the petitions on Brown and the information on Elliott. They were read at the Board meeting. Mr. Van Story knew of the memorandum (Presumably from the Deans and Chairman of Departments). He had seen them before.

Q. Why was not a full disclosure made to everyone? (There was some discussion here about President Elliott's not having been informed about the Faculty's objections to him)

A. I suspected it, and came to the conclusion the night before that there would probably be no election. I told Mr. Brown. He knew nothing about Elliott except for the biographical background. We thought because of the controversy that the search would have to continue. Others felt differently however. Then we voted to elect Dr. Elliott.

Q. How do you explain the fact that Dr. Elliott was not informed that Mr. Ellison had withdrawn from the Chairmanship?

A. This was an internal matter of the Board. It should not have any bearing on Dr. Elliott.

Q. He would feel somewhat cut off, inasmuch as Mr. Ellison was the one with whom he had had all his contacts?

A. There is nothing to be concerned about. He will have a strong relationship with the Board, because he is "the Board's creature."

Q. Has Dr. Elliott seen the document "Basic Considerations, etc."?

A. Yes, he received it a week ago.

Q. Have you seen it?

A. Yes.

Q. (There was a general discussion here about the land acquisitions of the University and Mr. Van Story believed it was a good thing. The Committee apparently did not. Professor Davison asked about the progress on the Law Library plans, commenting that the Library at present was totally inadequate and pointing out that although much land was acquired, very little building had been done. Much money had been drawn from the assets of the Law School which was now inaccessible to it as it remained tied up in the cost of land acquisitions. Mr. Davison feared that the present Law Library would probably not be accredited in the next survey.)

A. Mr. Van Story commented that the Board of Trustees was not complacent about these matters.

Q. (There was some discussion about the Perkins and Will report. Mr. Van Story claimed that the Board is not involved in the matter of land acquisition. This is a matter for the Administration. The committee brought up the matter of some property owned by the University between 19th and 20th Street which has reportedly just been leased to an outside tenant for five years, and which points to the fact that building for the University in that area will surely not begin for five years?)

A. Mr. Van Story stated that there is no doubt that The George Washington University

had not "gotten off the ground " but we are now acting to do so. The business of the University as it is brought to the Board is that everything is going along with no problems. So the Board goes along thinking everything is fine. Now that it has been made apparent by the newspaper stories that "where there is smoke, there is fire," he knows that something positive will be done.

Q. Do you think there will be any improvement made in Board-Faculty relations now that a new President has been chosen?

A. I think the relationship is going to be very helpful and increasingly the Board members will take a strong stand. They have never been presented with the problems. They are not going to cover them up and hope they will go away. We have no choice but to get off the ground and Dr. Elliott will have a lot of support.

Q.

A. Mr. Van Story talked about some of the factors in the selection of Elliott and mentioned that Mr. Morris will turn over a new leaf at the University also. He believes in communication.

Q. President Colclough's health has become a major problem. It is hoped that Dr. Elliott will be on the job quickly. There is a strong belief among the Faculty that President Colclough wishes to remain as President.

A. The Board is fully aware of the problems, including the interim administration problem. There is nothing the Faculty need be concerned with. They will all be dealt with satisfactorily.

Q. Is it not reasonable to assume that Mr. Morris and Mr. Phillips are closely associated with the ideas of the small group of people on the Board of Trustees which included Mr. Ellison?

A. Mr. Morris is a member of "the establishment." Mr. Phillips, however, is new to the Board.

Q. The Faculty is hesitant to put its full confidence in a man of 60 years?

A. There is some friction between the Board and the Faculty. Both are "throwing old cigar butts over the fence." The prime concern of the Faculty is to convince the Board that it has a valid position which the Board should respect. The Board does not appreciate or understand your problems. The Faculty has done several things which have added to the friction.

Mr. Van Story then described the AAUP Salary Scale resolution of the Senate which was presented to the Board in a "harsh" manner, and he said that the Board's reaction was also "harsh." He felt the matter should have been brought before a Faculty-Trustee committee to be ironed out before it was presented to the Board. He was not successful in referring the matter to such a committee, and the Board moved a "harsh" resolution which was voted upon but because of some confusion in the ballots was redrafted in a more modified form. Mr. Van Story said there were too many things involved to deal with such a large matter at a Board meeting. The fact that the resolution was stated so strongly built up resentment to it. They could have worked out something perhaps but with thirty people talking, it is difficult to evolve something on the floor. He feels strongly that a Faculty-Trustee Committee should deal with such matters. It should be "hammered out" in a committee. The mechanics are wrong as they stand now.

Q. To what extent do you think the members of the Board are aware that the AAUP salary scale showing The George Washington University low in C and D categories was republished in a local newspaper lately?

A. Mr. Van Story feels that he is appreciative of the Faculty's concern, although he does not think the Board is as acutely aware of the whole matter as the Faculty is.

Mr. Van Story then commented upon the AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS report as follows:

Mr. Van Story said it had been his desire that after the Board meeting the Trustee's Committee and the Board Committee should have met and been acquainted with the Board's decision. Frank (Weitzel) told Mr. Van Story that Professor Davison had not received its report. Mr. Van Story's agreement with President Colclough had been that the report should be presented to the Faculty Assembly. He was leaving town. He was to release this to the Faculty Assembly on Monday. I don't know why he did not. He said he wished to keep control of its release to the press.

We had access to your report and developed our own material which I conveyed to Professor Davison and we got very definitive reports from other schools . . . We wanted to see what other universities were doing. Our conclusions were that we did not see the economies per se. I ascertained for certain that we would be expelled from the Southern Conference if we abolished football.

Mr. Van Story feels the whole matter is not something you can put a dollar sign on. The thing is that if we left the Southern Conference and intended not to abandon all other aspects of our athletics program, we would have to set up our own scheduling. The thing they were trying to find out was what economies could they expect. They conferred at Howard University and Georgetown. Their conclusions were that they saw no economies.

(There was some discussion here of how strongly various groups felt on the athletics subject both pro and con, and in what unexpected areas such strong feelings seemed to exist.)

Mr. Van Story pointed out in this controversy all that was really said by the Board was that in this point of time, it did not agree with the University Senate. But here was one more pressure on the Board-Faculty relationship.

Mr. Van Story felt that the whole matter should have been solved administratively.

Mr. Van Story then commented on the AAUP SALARY SCALE RESOLUTION matter as follows:

Mr. Van Story claimed that the Faculty is placing too much emphasis on the fact that the Board Resolution was not directly a reply to the Faculty Resolution. The Faculty was asking the Board to commit itself to something without an escape clause.

Mr. Kraus pointed out the fact that although he could understand how necessary it was in obtaining good new professors, to offer salaries more in line with present day scales generally, it did produce an inequity in that the faculty of long-standing at the University were being paid less than new younger men who had just joined the University.

Mr. Van Story contended that such far-reaching matters should be brought to the Board with the President being in agreement with them.

Professor Davison said he thought the idea of joint-committee treatment might be tried in such cases as the salary matter also and Mr. Van Story stated that joint committees would have to wait upon Dr. Elliott's arrival. He should be given a chance to get here and show his stature before any innovations are made.

(There was some discussion here about "speaking the same language" in order to convey the thinking of the Faculty and the Trustees to each other)

Professor Kraus remarked that the Faculty Committee was set up to deal with the Trustees Committee in the election of a new President, but it was clearly stated by someone who was interviewed by this Committee that President Colclough had stated that Mr. Ellison would act as liaison between the two committees.

Mr. Van Story said, "That is his opinion." Looking at the practical, technical aspects of your own position, you have to make a report to the Faculty Assembly. This is not the time to make new decisions. We have to get Dr. Elliott in here. So many people have been wrong (or right) that there is much you can accomplish of a positive nature by setting forth your concerns. Certainly there is nothing to be done now without tying President Elliott's hands. In the talks of June 5, so many mistakes were made. I think you should just wait for a while.

Q. Professor Wood said, "We are concerned with the fact that when a new President is elected, there is no policy set that he should be approved by both the Faculty and the Trustees. We realize that it is your responsibility to elect a President. My surprise is at your reaction that it would not be established on a permanent basis that the Faculty should also approve him without the Faculty having to write a resolution or amend the Code?"

(There was a short description of Mr. Morris' remarks about when the decision is made, everyone then should "get on the bandwagon.")

A. Mr. Van Story stated that the Board had made the selection of President Carroll and perhaps it may have been a mistakeand now we have chosen Elliott.

Q. Professor Wood stated that the Committee has been trying to see how these things may be resolved constructively. It feels great progress has been made. It does not feel, however, that it can get a great heartfelt push behind President Elliott. He does not think we will get what we want unless the Board itself can give meaningful assurances to the effect that the policy would be, in choosing a permanent President, that he should be someone acceptable to both parties. There were such people.

A. Naturally Board-Faculty relationships are very important but we are getting into the area of specific recommendations, like joint committees, etc. This is not the time for that.

(There was some discussion here of the negative reaction of the Board to one of the presentations of the Faculty Committee at the Board Meeting and its possible influence on the vote cast)

Q. Have you heard about the reporter on one of the local papers who had begun to write a story on Elliott's election on June 4, but was discovered and stopped by the editor? I have this on excellent authority.

A. I have no evidence of such a story. I had background information on Elliott and all I knew were what posts he had held etc.

Q. Do you know that up to the last twelve days, Mr. Ellison offered the job to lots of people, which caused loss of respect for the University?

A. Your conclusion has to be that the Board Committee and the Faculty Committee were not equally influential.

(The Secretary left the meeting at this point, and the conversation became general for a short time thereafter).

JAMES C. VAN STORY, JR.
SUITE 606, 1725 EYE STREET, NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.
FEDERAL 8-7686

CHARTERED LIFE UNDERWRITER (C.L.U.)
ASSOCIATE GENERAL AGENT
PROVIDENT LIFE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY

LIFE INSURANCE AND INVESTMENT PLANS
FOR ESTATE, BUSINESS, TAX AND
CHARITABLE PURPOSES

PENSION AND PROFIT SHARING PLANS

Design-Installation-Service

July 6, 1965

Professor J.F. Davison, Chairman
University Senate Ad Hoc Committee
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Professor Davison:

I am recently informed that your committee has not received a copy of the Report of the Special Committee on Athletics which was presented to the Board of Trustees on June 5, 1965.

Please find a copy enclosed together with a copy of the two Resolutions that were adopted by the Board on that date.

I will be happy to discuss this report with you, if you wish, at your convenience.

Sincerely,


James C. Van Story

JCV:rb

Enclosures

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT THEIR MEETING
ON JUNE 5, 1965.

1. Resolved: That the Board of Trustees hereby authorizes and directs the planning for a student recreational activities building so as to develop information relative to construction costs, maintenance, operating expenses and overall financing..
2. Resolved: That the Board of Trustees, after due consideration of the University's intercollegiate football program, and with sincere appreciation of the views expressed by the faculty, students, alumni, and interested friends in the community, hereby endorses the continuation of intercollegiate football program and authorizes the University administration to implement this program on a positive basis.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington D. C.

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Assembly for the academic year 1965/66 was held at 3 p.m. Wednesday, September 15, 1965, Acting President Colclough presiding.

The minutes of the special meeting of June 7, 1965 were approved without exception.

The Acting President introduced Mr. Reuben E. Wood, Chairman of the Special Committee formed at the June 7th meeting as a result of the following resolution:

"That the Faculty Assembly appoint a Committee consisting of Professor Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, and Professor Wolfgang H. Kraus and Roderic H. Davison, former chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate to ascertain the facts in all cases in which the Board of Trustees have not seen fit or do not see fit to follow the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly or the University Senate and, with all reasonable speed, to report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly."

(Within a week of the appointment of this Committee, Mr. James Forrester Davison of the Law School was appointed by the Acting President in place of Mr. Roderic H. Davison, who was out of the country.)

After some brief preliminary remarks, Mr. Wood read the report of the Committee. Inasmuch as no discussion of the report was forthcoming, the Chairman accepted it as a matter of record of the Faculty Assembly, and a copy of the report and the preliminary remarks are attached to these minutes.

Mr. Perros, seconded by Mr. Naeser, moved that the Van Evera motion in the form of a resolution which had been tabled at the meeting of the Assembly on June 7, 1965 be removed from the table and this motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Thomas McP. Brown asked for a vote on the Van Evera resolution and the Faculty passed the Resolution as follows:

R E S O L U T I O N

"The Faculty Assembly of The George Washington University extends its greetings to its new president, Dr. Elliott, and assures him of its hearty cooperation in developing the potential of the University."

Chairman Colclough introduced Vice President and Treasurer Herzog to give a report on current building plans at the University. The Chairman stated this was in accordance with the motion of Mr. Miller of the Physical Facilities Committee which was passed at the May 20, 1965 meeting of the Faculty Assembly requesting that "further communication of the financial aspects of the building program be forthcoming."

Vice-President Herzog then gave the locations, approximate costs and sources of financing of six major building projects already underway at the University:

1. Remodeling of the University Hospital.
2. Construction of an office building to be leased to the National Academy of Sciences for 20 years.
3. Construction of a new Law Library, and renovation of Stockton Hall.
4. Construction of a University Center Building.
5. Renovation of the West View Apartment building acquired last year by the University, which will be used for administrative and faculty offices.
6. Projected classroom building on the north side of G Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets and connected with the School of Engineering for programs in the natural sciences or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages or engineering so as to qualify for a grant under the Undergraduate Title I section of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

Mr. Herzog indicated four other projects with no order of priority which are in the planning stages, and under close study at the present time:

1. A new and expanded Library Building.
2. A Science Center
3. A new Medical School
4. A recreation Physical Education Building

Mr. Herzog mentioned some small construction work which was completed during the summer or was presently being completed:

1. Small three-story office building for the Department of Physical Education for Women adjacent to the Women's Gymnasium.
2. A four-story building for shops, storerooms and facilities for plant engineers.
3. Renovation of a four-story building located at one of the main approaches to the University for use by the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies. (19th and G Streets)
4. Small office building for use of programs in Health Care at 815 21st Street.
5. Remodeling of the north wing of Chapin Hall.
6. Renovation of the basement in Building C for use by the Geology Department.
7. An addition to the greenhouse on the roof of Building "C".
8. Conversion of heating from coal to oil at the entrances of the the Library Building and Monroe Hall.
9. Construction of a new language laboratory in Monroe Hall.
10. Various small renovations in Buildings J & L, Corcoran Hall, Medical School laboratories, Buildings P and W.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Herzog for his report and mentioned that "a sort of sequitur" to this report was one from Mr. Warren Gould, Assistant Vice President for Resources, on the rise in income from the Annual Support Program in the past year. The Chairman said that the Annual Support Program had been under the national chairmanship of Mr. Edgar R. Baker, Vice President of Time, Inc. and an alumnus of the University. He stated that "we had a long way to go, but the amount of Annual Support this year of (\$236,000) bespeaks progress." The Acting President congratulated Mr. Gould on his fine accomplishment.

Chairman Colclough introduced Vice President and Dean of Faculties John Anthony Brown to the Assembly. Dean Brown spoke of the academic development of the University over the past year. He stressed that buildings should be erected to house carefully conceived programs as opposed to building edifices and then designing programs to fit them. Mr. Brown said the University had reached a point in its development in which it was able to "construct" a freshman class by careful admission practices which would admit students who fit into our milieu, rather than admit students unsuitable to it. He stated that the Faculty should impress the student with the idea that what takes place "inside the classroom" is more important than what may be outside, and each faculty member should teach to the highest level of his ability to sustain this idea. He recommended a review of off-campus programs which he said were as important to the University as its on-campus programs and had the same strengths and weaknesses. The Dean of Faculties stated that the University had become the third largest in the country in off-campus graduate programs offered but that academic quality-controls should be applied to their development and expansion. He stated this to be a high-priority matter for faculty attention. Mr. Brown stressed the importance of improving information-retrieval systems in the Library. He felt any new library building should incorporate the newest developments in these systems as well as being a more attractive or larger structure. He proposed intensive review of the research programs of the University, and the development of a "philosophy of research." Mr. Brown concluded by stating his hopes for growth in the Faculty Assembly and further support and encouragement to the work of the University Senate and its committees in order to strengthen these forums in speaking the mind of the Faculty.

Mr. Brown then asked each of the deans of the schools and colleges to introduce new members of his faculty. The Assembly welcomed its new members, following which, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm for a tea in Lisner Lounge.

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary